

MEETING MINUTES

EMPIRE STATION COMPLEX COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP

DATE/TIME: June 29, 2021 / 4:00pm EST

SUBJECT: DEIS Impacts & Public Realm Improvements

WEEK #: 10

MEETING LEADER: AKRF, WXY, and ESD

*The following minutes prepared by Empire State Development (ESD) are a summary of the meeting and are intended to capture only the main points made in the meeting. Discrepancies should be reported to Gabriella Green at ESD **within three (3) calendar days** of distribution of this document.*

PARTICIPANTS:

NAME	ORGANIZATION / AGENCY	NAME	ORGANIZATION / AGENCY
Hon. Gale Brewer	Manhattan Borough President	Peter Matusewitch	MTA
Robert Atturbury	U.S. Representative Jerrold Nadler	Robert Paley	MTA
Robert Gottheim	U.S. Representative Jerrold Nadler	Petra Messick	Amtrak
Shelby Garner	U.S. Representative Carolyn Maloney	Ryan Morson	Amtrak
Dario Quinsac	NYS Senator Robert Jackson	Sharon Tepper	Amtrak
Maia Berlow	NYS Senator Brad Hoylman	Joseph Quinty	NJ Transit
		Ed Pincar	NYC DOT
Wendi Paster	NYS Assemblyman Richard Gottfried	Kimberly Rancourt	NYC DOT
Matt Tighe	NYS Assemblyman Richard Gottfried	Jennifer Sta. Ines	NYC DOT
Lizette Chapparo	Manhattan Borough President's Office	Edith Hsu-Chen	NYC Department of Planning
Matt Green	NYC Councilman Corey Johnson	Josh Kraus	NYCEDC
Laurie Hardjowirogo	NYC Councilman Corey Johnson	Tyler Cukar	FX Collaborative
Marrissa Williams	32BJ	Stephan Dallendorfer	FX Collaborative
Kevin Finnegan	Labor lawyer, formerly 1199	Deniz Onder	FX Collaborative
Christine Berthet	Community Board 4	Jack Robbins	FX Collaborative
Paul Devlin	Community Board 4	John Schuyler	FX Collaborative
Jeffrey LeFrancois	Community Board 4	Amy Shell	FX Collaborative
Lowell Kern	Community Board 4	Toby Snyder	FX Collaborative
EJ Kalafarski	Community Board 5	Chi Chan	AKRF
Layla Law-Gisiko	Community Board 5	Connor Lacefield	AKRF
Clayton Smith	Community Board 5	Colin Montoute	WXY
Eugene Sinigalliano	Resident Representative	Claire Weisz	WXY
Dan Pisark	34 th Street Partnership	Chris West	Foster + Partners
Brook Jackson	Partnership for New York City	Tom Rousakis	Ernst & Young
Elizabeth Goldstein	The Municipal Art Society of NY	Judy Kessler	Vornado
Tom Wright	Regional Plan Association	Barry Langer	Vornado
Felicia Park-Rogers	Tri-State Transportation Campaign	Carl Weisbrod	Vornado (Consultant)
Marilyn Taylor	University of Pennsylvania	Audrey Wilson	Vornado
Tokumbo Shobowale	The New School	Will Burns	ESD
Wendy Hilliard	Women's Sports Foundation	Terence Cho	ESD
Larry Lennon	MTA	Anabel Frias	ESD

NAME	ORGANIZATION / AGENCY	NAME	ORGANIZATION / AGENCY
Gabriella Green	ESD		
Holly Leicht	ESD		
Phil Maguire	ESD		
Marion Phillips	ESD		
Angel Santana	ESD		
Rachel Shatz	ESD		
Noura von Briesen	ESD		

Location: Zoom

Item #	Description / Discussion
1.	<p><u>INTRODUCTION AND HOUSEKEEPING MATTERS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marion Phillips, Senior VP of Community Relations at ESD, reminded all attendees to list their full name and affiliation in the Zoom Participant List. Marion advised the CACWG that any members having difficulty logging into Huddle should contact Angel Santana for further assistance. All CACWG members are encouraged to review and download the materials posted to Huddle for the meeting minutes, the presentations, and follow-up materials. Gabriella Green, CACWG Facilitator, announced that ESD posted two documents to Huddle in response to questions from Eugene Sinigalliano regarding potential property acquisition on Block 780.
2.	<p><u>AKRF PRESENTATION: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT AREAS OF ANALYSIS & IMPACTS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connor Lacefield, Senior Technical Director at AKRF, introduced the environmental areas of analysis studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (“DEIS”) for the Empire Station Complex project (“Project” or “ESC Project”) outlined in the General Project Plan (“GPP”). The DEIS identified certain significant adverse impacts as well as practicable mitigation measures for the majority of those impacts. ESD is continuing to explore additional mitigation measures for inclusion in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (“FEIS”). Areas in which significant adverse impacts were identified and mitigation measures proposed include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Open Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slide 3 shows the study area for the DEIS Open Space analysis and the open spaces resources located within the study area. The sole direct impact on open space is the elimination of the privately owned public space (“POPS”) on Site 5. The indirect impact on open space is an increased demand for open space due to the introduction of a substantial new worker population to the study area. Potential mitigation measures for these impacts include creating new open spaces and/or providing funding for improvements or upgrades to existing open spaces in the study area. The proposed High Line connector connecting the High Line spur at 30th Street and Tenth Avenue to the Manhattan West development will also partially mitigate impacts on open space. ➤ Shadows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slide 4 shows the study area for the Shadows analysis, and the open spaces and historic resources located in the Shadows study area. The DEIS identifies shadow impacts on six open spaces including Plaza 33, Chelsea Park and Herald Square Park. The DEIS also identifies shadow impacts on four sun-sensitive historic resources including the Moynihan Train Hall (“Moynihan”) skylight, the stained-glass windows in

Item #	Description / Discussion
	<p>St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church on 34th Street, and St. Francis of Assisi Church on 31st Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Potential mitigation measures for shadow impacts on open spaces include funding for improvements such as relocation of seating. ○ For shadow impacts on historic resources, ESD is consulting with the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, and Historic Preservation ("OPRHP") on appropriate mitigation measures. <p>➤ Historic and Cultural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Slide 5 shows an excerpt of the map for the Historic and Cultural Resources analysis study area. ○ The Penn Station Service Building (Site 2), Church of St. John the Baptist (Site 2), and Hotel Pennsylvania (Site 7) are notable historic resources in the area. The DEIS identifies adverse impacts on historic and cultural resources as a result of the removal of these and other structures on Sites 2 and 3. ○ Potential mitigation measures for impacts on historic resources include conducting Historic American Building Surveys ("HABS") documentation for permanent recordation of these buildings and/or determining whether any significant architectural features from these buildings could be salvaged and incorporated into new buildings or the new station. ○ The DEIS also identifies impacts to six historic structures within 90 feet of a future construction site. Construction protection plans would be required for these resources. ○ ESD is consulting with OPRHP on appropriate mitigation measures for impacts on historic and cultural resources to be included in the FEIS. <p>➤ Visual Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The DEIS analyzed the urban design and visual experience of a pedestrian in the area and the Project's effect on the arrangement, appearance, and functionality of the built environment. The image on Slide 6 shows the skyline cross-section view of the proposed buildings in context with existing and future planned buildings in the area. ○ Impacts would result from the demolition of two visual resources (Church of St. John the Baptist and the former Gimbel's Skybridge connected to Site 8 over 32nd Street) and the obstruction of certain views of the Empire State Building. ○ The mitigation measures previously mentioned for historic resources would partially mitigate the visual resources impacts on Church of St. John the Baptist. However, the impacts from the demolition of the Gimbels Skybridge and the obstruction of certain views of the Empire State Building would remain unmitigated. <p>➤ Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The DEIS identifies adverse impacts to traffic, transit and pedestrians. ESD is continuing to work with New York City Department of Transportation ("DOT"), MTA, and New York City Transit ("NYCT") to refine potential mitigation measures for these impacts. ○ For vehicle traffic impacts, the DEIS identifies traffic flow improvements such as changes to signal timing, street geometry, and parking regulations as potential mitigation measures. ○ For pedestrian impacts, the DEIS identifies removing or relocating street furniture, constructing curb extensions, changing pedestrian signal timing, and/or widening crosswalks as potential mitigation measures. ○ Additionally, a Transportation Monitoring Plan ("TMP") would be developed in collaboration with transportation agencies and coordinated with certain development milestones to address vehicle and pedestrian impacts. The TMP would study traffic and

Item #	Description / Discussion
	<p>pedestrian conditions in the future as the GPP developments come online to assess the effects of new development on existing conditions. The mitigation proposals would be re-evaluated on an ongoing basis in light of these effects on traffic and pedestrian conditions, and adjustments to the mitigation measures would be made as needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For transit, the DEIS identifies impacts relating to station circulation elements and control areas, and line-haul conditions on subway lines serving Penn Station. Potential mitigation measures include stairway and escalator widenings, addition of turnstiles to subway control areas, and increasing subway service frequency. In addition, the DEIS acknowledges that improvements as a result of the Penn Station Master Plan (“PSMP”), such as the underground concourse system discussed in CACWG #9, may also mitigate impacts on transit. <p>➤ Noise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Slide 8 shows the location of anticipated noise impacts identified in the DEIS, resulting from Project-generated truck traffic that would travel on DOT-designated truck routes on 30th and 31st Streets. ○ Potential mitigation measures that would partially mitigate noise impacts include the provision and installation of storm windows and window air conditioners to the impacted residential buildings that do not already have insulated glass windows and/or an alternate means of ventilation. <p>➤ Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The DEIS analyzed an illustrative construction schedule and identified construction period traffic impacts, which could be mitigated by measures similar to the mitigation measures proposed for traffic impacts. ○ The DEIS also identified construction period noise impacts. The DEIS would require that construction activities follow the requirements of the New York City Noise Control Code and undertake other mitigation measures. ○ However, even with these mitigation measures, temporary significant adverse construction noise impacts would still occur at certain locations near the Project area. These locations are indicated on Slide 9 in purple. Further mitigation measures for construction noise impacts include the use of drilled piles instead of impact-driven piles where feasible and practicable, and the provision and installation of storm windows and window air conditioners to the impacted residential buildings. ○ Long-term construction activity related to the proposed southward expansion of Penn Station and the proposed construction of new buildings on Sites 1, 2, and 3 would have disruptive impacts on the character of the neighborhood in the immediate vicinity for an extended period. Measures to reduce noise, air quality, and vibration impacts during construction would alleviate these impacts but would not fully mitigate them. ○ Construction activities from the Project would also have adverse impacts on historic and cultural resources. These impacts would be mitigated by construction protection plans described earlier as mitigation measures for impacts on historic and cultural resources. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The DEIS considers a range of development alternatives to determine whether any of these alternatives can avoid or reduce Project-related significant adverse impacts while still achieving the Project’s goals and objectives. The alternatives considered by the DEIS include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No Action Alternative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This alternative predicts and evaluates conditions that would materialize in the future if the Project is not constructed. ➤ No Unmitigated Significant Adverse Impacts Alternative

Item #	Description / Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This alternative considers development that would eliminate the Project’s significant adverse impacts. ○ The analysis of this alternative concludes that any level of development would result in unmitigated impacts for shadows, transportation, and construction.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lower Density Alternative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This alternative considers a Project program that would have less total square footage of development than what is proposed by the Project. ○ The DEIS found that this alternative would be less successful in meeting the goals and objectives of the Project and would result in many of the same significant adverse impacts as the proposed Project.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Residential Alternative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This alternative was included in the DEIS in response to community feedback during the EIS scoping period and considers the potential for residential development on Sites 1, 4, and 8. Under this alternative, 30% of all residential units would be permanently affordable housing units. ○ While this alternative would substantially meet the goals and objectives of the proposed Project, it would also result in many of the same adverse impacts as the proposed Project and result in a new adverse impact for childcare services.
3. <u>WXY PRESENTATION: EMPIRE STATION COMPLEX DISTRICT</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claire Weisz, Principal-in-Charge at WXY Architecture, presented a broad vision for the public realm in the Empire Station Complex (“ESC”) district, focusing on principles that would help create different but linked spaces for residents, workers, and people taking trains. • Times Square had similar challenges as the ESC district and went through a public space transformation that has given it a clear pedestrian-centric identity. Taking lessons from Times Square, one criterion for the success of the ESC district is to achieve a physical, cultural, and social identity all its own, separate from areas to the east and west. • Desire lines for pedestrian traffic in the ESC district show pedestrians want to travel through and across the district, including through the center Penn Station/MSG block. • Another important factor for the success of the ESC public realm is district-wide accessibility to ensure people who may be, for example, physically disabled or traveling with luggage can navigate the public realm, including multiple levels within the stations and connections across different transit systems.
4. <u>WXY PRESENTATION: PUBLIC SPACE NETWORK AND MOBILITY</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the Project’s rail improvements, there need to be broader mobility improvements that can evolve over time, weaving a set of discrete public space improvements into a public realm network that will allow for seamless pedestrian mobility and interconnectivity. • Examples of contemporary mobility improvements that set a new standard for connectivity include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fulton Street Transit Center, where different door systems and highly visible entrances at all four corners of the station greatly enhance accessibility and mobility; ➤ Rotterdam, where bike storage areas, ramps, “rampolators,” and extra-large elevators in transit stations ease movement in and around the stations, collapsing the distinction between the indoor and outdoor public realm; and ➤ Asia, where the roofs of transit buildings are considered part of the mobility system and provide additional accessibility. • We should think of the ESC district as a mobility district similar to that in London that links St. Pancras Station and Kings Cross. Approaching the public realm around transportation hubs as a “mobility

Item #	Description / Discussion
	<p>district” focuses on how people know where they are and how the spaces in the district are organized and connected to the street level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is also helpful to look at pedestrianized transit districts such as those found in Copenhagen, Lausanne, the Wall Street area, and Philadelphia. In a successful pedestrianized transit district, the streetscape and sidewalks become part of the district, and the public spaces can feature seasonal programming. Smaller retail works well in pedestrianized transit districts because it meets the needs of commuters and establishes meeting places for people. For the ESC district, the blocks from Seventh to Eighth Avenues and 30th to 33rd Streets should be the central space of the larger district and serve as a mobility hub.
5. <u>WXY PRESENTATION: ESC PUBLIC SPACE NETWORK</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corners are critical to successful public space networks, and they are challenging in the ESC district. The corners should prioritize: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identity: knowing where you are and where to go, establishing a coherent experience ➤ Street Life: seeing ways to navigate at street level as well as choices to connect to transit below ➤ Visibility: improving the experience of traversing the district and station through clear views, natural light, and lighting A Nolli Map of the ESC district shows all private and public spaces in the area and reveals a lot of both indoor and outdoor spaces available for public use that should be considered in assessing how the public could access and flow through the district. The at-grade public realm, the below-grade concourses, and the entry points to those concourses should all be thought about together to ensure a unified public space network. The ESC district should strive to achieve three characteristics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Unified Transportation Hub: travelers can easily identify where they are and where to go, and spaces can be shared among different users for a coherent experience ➤ Green District: pedestrians and cyclists are prioritized; green roofs and other zero carbon strategies are incorporated ➤ Accessibility: welcoming and flexible movement across the streets, blocks, and edges for all people traveling through the district Looking west down 31st Street from Seventh Avenue highlights many important questions regarding the design of the public realm: what is the role of trees; what building views should be prioritized for navigation (eg, Moynihan); what is the role of the proposed plaza; how do design controls like building setbacks, street treatments like curbs and bollards, and pedestrianized streets define the public realm? These questions lead to a larger discussion on the role of open space to relieve congestion, connect buildings and allow programming as part of a mobility district that adds to what is happening on the sidewalks. There is real potential for ESC to be a mixed-use mobility district. This requires: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Mobility equity and focus on the best ways for people (able-bodied and disabled) to navigate between transit modes; ➤ Providing seating, shade, amenities and familiar open views; ➤ Making connected/consistent public spaces of the highest quality, designed to accommodate all connections to and from the district and new technologies and new modalities in the future; and ➤ Achieving the sustainability and zero waste goals of NYS and NYC through green systems, micro-climate features and prioritization of walking, cycling and all forms of public transit. The transformation of the Times Square public realm shows the vitality that can be achieved when people have enough space to interact with the public realm in different ways.
6. <u>ESD PRESENTATION: PUBLIC REALM PRINCIPLES</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Holly Leicht, Executive VP of Real Estate Development & Planning at ESD, went over the major principles that ESD has taken away from WXY’s work:

Item #	Description / Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Connectedness of spaces, particularly focusing on the midblock connection from 30th Street through Penn to Plaza 33 ➤ Integration of outdoor and indoor public spaces and viewing both in a holistic way ➤ Visibility and how people understand and navigate the district, particularly from Seventh and Eighth Avenues ➤ Coordination among the different agencies with jurisdiction over the public realm (including ESD, City DOT, private development partners, the railroads (Amtrak, MTA, and NJ Transit) and community stakeholders) ➤ Evolution of the public realm over time, as the district builds out over decades

7. Q&A AND COMMENTS

- Paul Devlin, CB4
 - The principles outlined in Claire’s presentation about a mobility district, the development of the public realm, and the prioritization of pedestrians exemplify how we should be thinking about the redevelopment of the ESC district. The ESC Project needs to be thought of as a transit hub that development would support.
 - Mobility towards the Port Authority Bus Terminal (“PABT”) needs to be considered.
 - The conclusion that the Lower Density Alternative will not achieve the Project’s goals and objectives does not seem apt because we do not yet know the costs of the Penn Station projects or the amount of funding that the Project will generate.
- Layla Law-Gisiko, CB5
 - What data and information led to the DEIS’s conclusions that the identified historic resources cannot be preserved, and that all views of the Empire State Building cannot be protected?
 - The DEIS contains a discussion of how the bulk, massings, and heights of the buildings would need to be changed or reduced to preserve the views of the Empire State Building. The DEIS concludes that the reduction in buildings heights, particularly on Sites 2 and 6, required to protect these views is too substantial to meet the Project goals.
 - The DEIS contains a discussion of only one view of the Empire State Building (from the east) that cannot be mitigated. CB5 has requested that more views be analyzed and that a clearer explanation of why all views of the Empire State Building cannot be preserved or why an alternative approach to the building design cannot be used to preserve the views.
 - The public realm presentation presents many ideal principles for the public realm, but in practice, these may not be all possible to implement. For example, it may not be possible to put trees on 33rd Street.
 - There are only a small number of historic resources in the area that are impacted, and CB5 believes a different approach could salvage some or all these resources and incorporate them in the Project. In particular, the Gimbels Skybridge should be preserved.
 - CB5 agrees that more density makes sense in the Penn Station area, but a gentler and more delicate urban design approach needs to be taken. The number of impacts is not too many to mitigate—the views of the Empire State Building are the only views of concern, and the number of historic resources impacted is small. These critical visual and historic resources could be preserved and yield a better project.
- Tokumbo Shobowale, New School
 - Claire’s presentation was very helpful because it showed that a transportation hub in the heart of New York City can be centered around people. The examples of other mobility districts around the world help visualize ways in which mobility districts are accessible and connected.
 - Can we incorporate into the Project plans designating the blocks between 30th and 33rd Streets and Seventh and Eighth Avenues as one district? In addition, can more openness on the sidewalks and claiming the streets be part of the Project plans?

Item #	Description / Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ESD is reviewing the GPP and DGs with the concepts presented today in mind. For certain items such as the streets, ESD will continue its coordination with other agencies. This is the evolutionary process and coordination with other agencies described earlier. ➤ Can restrictions and/or guidelines on loading for Madison Square Garden (“MSG”) be part of the GPP? ➤ It is important for the ESC district to have visual and physical connections to 34th Street. It seems that real Bus Rapid Transit (“BRT”) or surface level mass transit is inevitable on this major east-west corridor. How can we create connections between the ESC district and the 34th Street corridor? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Claire Weisz responded that 34th Street remains a challenging area but is possible to integrate into the ESC mobility district. This should be thought about in the process.
•	Robert Atturbury, Rep. Nadler <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There seems to be a contradiction between some of the mitigation measures proposed in the DEIS and some of the goals that we have for the public realm. For example, the DEIS proposes the removal of street furniture and street trees as a mitigation measure, but in the presentation shown today, adding furniture and trees seems to be a goal. ➤ Has ESD vetted the feasibility of increasing subway service as a mitigation measure with MTA? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Peter Matusewitch responded that like bus service, the frequency of subway service is evaluated on the basis of actual ridership data and regular monitoring of running times, so this would not be determined so far in advance. Some short-term solutions such as using a different type of train car may be implemented to add capacity, but some subway lines are at maximum capacity already and will not be able to see increased service without major capital projects. ➤ How are you balancing the scale of the development with impacts that are unmitigable or propose a mitigation measure that ESD cannot control? The issues described above with increasing subway service is an example. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ESD is still looking at additional mitigation measures based on feedback from the CACWG and working with other agencies and its consultants. ESD is working with other agencies and partners to implement any mitigation measures that ESD cannot unilaterally do.
•	Christine Berthet, CB4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It seems as if the Project is proceeding in reverse: the GPP developments are supposed to support the construction of the new station, but we have not yet seen plans for the new station. In addition, we have been talking about designing the public realm at the same time or after the buildings are built. We need to design the public realm before the buildings are designed, and the community needs to be involved in the design process. ➤ The pedestrian volume projections need to be re-evaluated so that the right design decisions for the public realm are made. There will be more pedestrians traveling to the west side than what MTA has shown in its presentations. ➤ The public realm for the ESC district should be extended northward to include other major entrances to Penn Station located to the north of the Project area.
•	Eugene Sinigalliano, Resident <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The southward expansion of Penn Station has been the only Penn Expansion alternative discussed and presented to the CACWG. We need to see and review the other alternatives for Penn Expansion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The presentation of the other Penn Expansion alternatives is part of the federal National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) review process which will be kicked off by the release by the MTA of the Alternatives Report outlining each of the alternatives in greater detail.

Item #	Description / Discussion
	<p>MTA will be releasing this report later this summer, and the CACWG will be notified once it is available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A request has been made to see a full presentation of the ReThinkNYC plan, but no response has been given. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The local elected officials and Community Boards are planning a meeting for ReThinkNYC to present. ➤ Many residents who are at risk of displacement have not been notified. Everyone who is at risk should be sent a certified mail return receipt letter notifying them about the process and the meetings that will be held. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The local elected officials are planning to host two upcoming meetings, one specifically for residents and a second for the public at large. Wendi Paster (AM Gottfried) stated that the local elected officials will be sending postcards to all at-risk residents notifying them of the upcoming meetings. ○ Although it is too soon to lay out details about the possible acquisition and relocation of tenants on Block 780, a document that gives a general overview of the acquisition and relocation process as governed by NEPA has been posted to Huddle. In addition, at the anticipated residents' meeting, a member of ESD's legal team who was formerly at the MTA and has extensive experience with transportation project acquisitions will talk through the acquisition and relocation process and explain how much time the process typically takes and how relocation typically works. ➤ Business owners who are at risk should also be notified of the upcoming meetings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wendi Paster indicated that local business owners and tenants are being notified of the upcoming meetings. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeffrey LeFrancois, CB4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What are the factors that determine whether and how an impact gets mitigated? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Determining mitigation is a granular and involved process that evaluates each impact and the possible mitigation measures. Some mitigation measures are determined to be impracticable, and others are determined to conflict with the goals and objectives of the project. In some cases, a proposed mitigation measure is not desired by the affected party, and the party prefers an alternative approach. Where applicable, ESD works with other agencies to identify reasonable mitigation measures such as the examples described earlier in coordination with OPHRP and DOT. ➤ Why was MSG and its operations not studied in the DEIS or the presentation we saw today on the public realm? Did ESD tell its consultants to ignore MSG? We need to see proposals that include plans to relocate MSG. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ESD did not instruct its consultants to ignore MSG. As the CACWG has heard, it is presumed that MSG would stay at its current location because moving it does not meet the goal of increasing rail capacity at Penn Station, nor does it meet the timeline or cost considerations of the Railroad Projects. ○ ESD acknowledges that MSG's loading operations should be addressed in order to maximize the goals of the Project, particularly with respect to the public realm. This is an area where coordination among the various public and private entities with jurisdiction over and impact on the public realm is essential. • Elizabeth Goldstein, MAS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Have you thought about the ESC mobility district more broadly, including areas outside the Project Area such as Herald Square, Hudson Yards, East Midtown and West Chelsea? Do you have any observations about what needs to happen to reinforce the ideas that you have presented for the ESC district in areas outside of the district?

Item #	Description / Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Claire Weisz responded that the type of public realm she showed requires an ongoing engagement process among multiple decision-making agencies and the community and must include champions who can advocate for the prioritization of pedestrians. ○ It is important to think about public realm connections beyond the Project Area, but it is also critical to think granularly about the immediate public realm. There is a lot that can be done within the Project Area to create a meaningful, distinctive, integrated public realm in the ESC district itself.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Can the systems on the ground and below ground reinforce each other? What changes do we need to do to make those systems truly integrated? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For the below-ground and above-ground systems to work with each other, there needs to be a process that looks comprehensively and simultaneously at design quality for above and below grade public spaces and buildings.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Marilyn Taylor, UPenn <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ As Claire mentioned in her presentation, the principle of identity and knowing where you are is critical to the success of transit hubs where there are multiple directions and pathways above and below ground. Understanding orientation allows travelers, commuters, and the community to all share in the experience of being in and around a station. It would be helpful to look more closely at other station examples, such as Kings Cross and St. Pancras in London, to see how they handle multiple pathways and provide a sense of orientation.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Carl Weisbrod, Vornado <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Connecting the public realm to below-grade and above-grade connections is important to the success of the district, but, responding to Christine's comment, it is not realistic to fully design the public realm before designing the buildings. The GPP provides a framework of principles and process that should allow the public realm to evolve over time, with public input.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Christine Berthet, CB4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A fully designed public realm is not necessary, but at the minimum, we need to establish a framework of principles that would lead to building controls that ensure that the development of the buildings fits with the vision for the public realm.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Gale Brewer, MBP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Who are the residents that will be invited to the residents' meetings on July 13? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Community Board organizers are planning to invite all commercial and residential tenants occupying the Sites 1, 2, and 3 blocks who may be impacted by a southward expansion of Penn Station.

8. QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS POSTED IN ZOOM CHAT OR POST-CACWG FOLLOW-UP

- Tom Wright, RPA
 - There are many ways to create vital connectivity between the underground station and the public realm. It will need continued and vigilant advocacy as the station design evolves.

9. CONCLUSION

- Gabriella presented the schedule for the next few weeks:
 - July 6: no CACWG meeting
 - July 13: residents/tenants' meeting will be hosted by local elected officials and CBs; ESD will present an overview of the ESC Project, provide general background on the typical property acquisition and relocation process for transportation projects, and answer questions
 - July 15: public "town hall" will be hosted by local elected officials and CBs; ESD will present an overview of the ESC Project and answer questions
 - July 27: CACWG will present its summary report of feedback on the ESC Project

Item #	Description / Discussion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Robert Atturbury (Rep. Nadler), Raju Mann (NYC Council), and Wendi Paster (AM Gottfried) will be reaching out to the larger CACWG to discuss formulation of the CACWG's recommendations. Members of the CACWG are also welcomed to reach out to Robert, Raju, and Wendi to discuss the report. Holly Leicht thanked everyone for participating, and Marion Phillips closed CACWG #10.